



AF

IFW 2182

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT OFFICE

APPLICANT: E. Welbergen **PATENT APPLICATION**
SERIAL NO.: 10/507, 509 **Examiner:** Jasjit S. Vidman
FILING DATE: September 10, 2004 **Group Art Unit** 2182
TITLE: System for Providing an Input
Signal Device for Use in Such a
System and Computer Input Device **Attorney Docket No.** 0005294.0001

MAIL STOP AMENDMENT
Commissioner for Patents
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

RESPONSE

Dear Sir:

This is in response to the Official Action rendered October 11, 2006 and an office communication dated November 24, 2006.

The Official Action of October 11, 2006 was designated a final rejection although the Examiner cited as a principal reference against a majority of the claims a patent (Lignoul) that had never been cited before. The Examiner, Mr. Vidman was called shortly after the action was received and in a telephone discussion with him we took the position that the Final Rejection was premature since in his action the principal reference (Kehlstadt) was withdrawn from a majority of the claims. More specifically in the Examiner's response to applicant's arguments he only reapplied the Kehlstadt reference to Claims 26, 27 and 32. It must be noted that the final rejection was, in our view, not warranted since there were very few claims that were changed. We thus had no chance to consider the completely new reference prior to a final rejection being rendered.

This precise matter was raised with Mr. Vidman and he telephoned back to state that upon reconsideration and an appropriate exchange of documents, he would withdraw the final rejection.

It was the writer's understanding that he would be sent a communication and that upon a request for reconsideration the final rejection would be withdrawn.

I apparently misunderstood Mr. Vidman since a communication was not received and after a further phone call to Mr. Vidman, I was sent the communication of November 24, 2006, hereinbefore referred to.

In response thereto, I hereby request withdrawal of the Final Rejection of October 11, 2006, for the reasons set forth above, and that this amendment be considered timely filed and another official action rendered.

It is noted that the communication of November 24, 2006, had to be responded to within one month and that the request is being filed within the one month period.